670 Doane Avenue,
Claremont, Calif.,
August 20, 1958

Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J.,
National Catholic Rural Life Conference,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Father:

I am enclosing a statement which you may already have seen or heard about from Father McCullough or one of our other mutual friends. I do not believe, however, that you are familiar with the repercussions it has had. In my opinion, it makes a rather interesting story.

I prepared this statement at the request of Bard McAllister, of the American Friends Service Committee, for purposes of discussion at a meeting of the regional AFSC Executive Committee. The purpose of the meeting was to arrive at a Friends policy statement vis-a-vis the bracero program. I had watched this group in action before and had reason to believe they would incline toward a weak position, so I prepared a very strong statement, hoping to shake them up a bit. (As things turned out, ironically enough, a number of groups were shaken up by the statement -- and shaken up in unexpected ways -- but the AFSC was not among them. I don't believe my plea had the slightest influence upon the group for which it was intended.) After the meeting, Bard McAllister asked me if he might circulate the statement among certain persons who had not been at the Executive Committee meeting. I expressed my doubts that it was the sort of thing suitable for general consumption, and in any case that he was not to circulate it with my name attached. Nonetheless, the AFSC office in San Francisco sent it out to a mailing list of 90 persons, and with my name attached. Now the fun began.

Some person or persons on the AFSC mailing list placed a copy or copies of the statement in the hands of the Department of Labor regional office, and the State Farm Placement Service. You may have heard of Mr. Glenn Brockway, who runs the former, and Mr. Ed Hayes, who runs the latter. As far as I have been able to piece subsequent developments together (these gentlemen have ignored my requests for explanations), these things then took place: (1) the Farm Placement Service and/or Department of Labor struck off a large number of additional copies of the statement and circulated them to Farm Placement offices, growers, compliance officers, reception centers, migratory stations, etc., both domestic and foreign; the cover letter that must have accompanied is better imagined than described; (2) I received demands from three government agencies (the Immigration and Naturalization Service was added to the act) that I explain my statement to their satisfaction or suffer the consequences; (3) even before I had had a chance to reply to these demands, pressure was brought to bear by four government agencies (the Public Health Service was now added to the act) upon the University of California to have my employment terminated. Among minor

harrassments, too numerous to go into in detail, I might mention that my interviewer, an altogether innocent party, was kicked out of Empalme, where he was trying to go about his business, and had his interviewing materials snatched out of his hands at El Centro. (You will recall that the purpose of the project with which my interviewer and I are associated is about as non-controversial as you can get: the assessment of braceros' ideas about public health, medical care, sanitation, hygiene, and diet.)

I have been ordered by my superiors at the University to report to Berkeley next Monday to show cause why I should not be fired. It is an interesting way to run a University.

Why should I burden you with all this? There are three reasons that come to mind at the moment:

(1) Since my statement of conscience has done me just about as much harm as it could possibly do, I feel I might as well try to salvage something from the wreckage by sending it to places where it is apt to receive a somewhat kindlier reception than it has received so far. (I am just conceited and s tubborn enough, you see, to believe still that I said nothing sinful, but, on the contrary, said some things of moral importance that badly needed saying.)

(2) Among your many contacts in the Legislative and Executive arms, do you know anyone who might be interested in this singular reaction of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Employment Security to the truth? Do you know anyone who might be interested in the Bureau's attempt (apparently a highly successful one) to dictate the hiring and firing policy of a State university? I have had no help whatsoever from the AFSC or from my colleagues at the university (both of w hich groups are very fond of proclaiming their devotion to academic freedom). To tell you the truth, Father, I do not feel too comfortable with the array of foes presently ranged against me, and it would be mightily cheering to have so slight an assist as an inquiry directed from some such strategically located person as a Congressman or a Senator to some strategically located person on the other side of the fence -- Mr. Brockway, perhaps, or Mr. Goodwin, or Mr. Mitchell.

(3) Most specifically of all, I would like to ask you if you have been hounded by the Department of Labor and others as a consequence of your testimony before the Gathings subcommittee on June 12. There are many similarities between our two statements, including some of the very points which have provoked the administrating agencies to hysterical wrath and reprisals against me. For example, you state that "few who are interested in this issue are unaware of or unable to cite specific instances of gross negligence and even of venal collusion in applying the certification requirements of Public Law 78." Although I use different language, it is this sort of thing which has lead the Hayes and Brockway offices to say, "Either you prove this in such a way it will st and up in court, or we will ruin you professionally." It would be of some assistance to me, I think, if I could point out that the administration of Public Law 78 has been subjected to a good deal of vigorous public criticism by a good many people, and that in singling me out as a special scapegoat they are meting out very uneven handed justice indeed. Please let me know if you have been receiving poison pen letters of the type suggested above, as the aftermath of your June 12 statement.

Messrs. Hayes and Brockway have let the University know that if I issue a public retraction, they may call off the dogs. The University has let me know, in turn, that it expects me to make such a retraction. I fear their sense of values and proportion is inverted. I would like a public apology from Messrs. Hayes and Brockway, and a number of their underlings and overlings (whom, to keep the story simple, I have not named here) who have been doing their hatchet work for them in this instance. I'm going to fight them, since I can appease them only at the cost of my honor. I am going to try to vindicate my veracity, and get some sort of acknowledgement, even if tacit, from the University that despite the smears I am in fact just as competent a research associate as I was before I had the temerity to criticize (for a private audience, be it remembered!) the most noxious public scandal of our generation. When I

Then, when I can do so without being under a cloud, I expect I shall resign from my position with the University of California. I don't believe I would care to continue to be associated with an institution of higher learning which demonstrates itself so susceptible to the most ~~naked and most self-interested~~ sort of outside pressure.

Thanks for letting me bend your ear.

Cordially,

Henry P. Anderson

P.S. You don't know any institutions or organizations which will have an opening for a highly qualified research associate in a month or two, do you? Vita sent upon request. The employing institution or organization must also meet certain qualifications. It must be interested in social justice, and it must possess a certain amount of courage.